

VOLUME 2/21: H.D. WILSON, NEILL, A.W. "EXCLUSION OF
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION", HOUSE OF COMMONS,
OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES, 17 FEB. 1938.

*With the Compliments of
A. W. Neill, M.P.*

Oriental

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES
OFFICIAL REPORT

EXCLUSION OF JAPANESE
IMMIGRATION

SPEECH

B.33154

OF

Mr. A. W. NEILL

(MEMBER FOR COMOX-ALBERNI)

ON

THE APPLICATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1923 TO
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON FEBRUARY 17, 1938

Archives
of
British Columbia

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, REVISED STATUTES, 1927, CHAPTER 95

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni) moved the second reading of Bill No. 11, respecting Japanese immigration.

He said: As I explained on the first reading of the bill, the purport of it is to place Japanese immigration into Canada on exactly the same plane, neither higher nor lower, as that occupied by the Chinese since 1923 when their immigration was last dealt with.

Ever since British Columbia joined confederation the question of oriental immigration and their penetration into every phase of life and industry in that province has been a consideration and an ever-increasing problem for us to deal with there. As far back as 1875 we find the province of British Columbia passing an act forbidding orientals to have votes. At that time the oriental immigration was entirely Chinese; there were no Japanese. At this point I might follow to its conclusion the history of Chinese immigration, as I want to use it as a parallel to what we should do in connection with the Japanese. Large numbers of Chinese were brought in to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Their competition in the labour market attracted the ill-will of the labour element, and on representations made the dominion government first in 1885 imposed a poll tax, or an entrance fee if you like, of \$50 per head. In 1901 that was increased to \$100 and, in 1904, to \$500 on every Chinaman entering Canada. It did not apply to Japanese. It was intended to restrict Chinese immigration, but it was not effective. There may have been a temporary check, but it did not amount to anything. It did lead to an undesirable condition, little if at all better than peonage, because large Chinese financial companies would put up the \$500 and the man's fare and would proceed to retrieve their money by a lien on the wretched man's wages. That has been done away with for fifteen years, but I am told that there are still Chinamen contributing out of their scanty earnings to repay these big companies which financed their entry into Canada.

Without going into the methods that led to it I will say shortly that in 1923 we passed chapter 95, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, and I might quote briefly its provisions.

From beginning to end it does not use the word "exclusion"; it simply says that entry into Canada is confined to the following classes of people of Chinese origin or descent, then naming the classes: the diplomatic service and those connected with them; children born in Canada going away for their education; merchants and students. That is all. No labour immigration whatever is allowed. And merchants and students are strictly limited; they have to have a passport issued by the Chinese government and visad by our agent in China. The result has been—it may suit some to say that it is not total exclusion but to all intents and purposes it is total exclusion of Chinese, which it was intended to be. It has worked well, cured a long-standing sore, and there has been no ill-will or dissension or discontent among the Chinese so excluded, with only one exception; they resent and will continue to resent the fact that we have discriminated against them in favour of the Japanese, because we allow a certain number of Japanese to come in. The Chinese also have their pride and do not like this.

Now I have before me the last report of the department of immigration, issued a few days ago. It shows that during the last fiscal year one Chinese immigrant and three students were admitted. And they have a system of allowing Chinese in on temporary permits; missionaries, professors and people like that can come in for a short period, generally six months. Forty-two such permits were issued, and more than half, in fact the bulk of those so admitted, had left Canada within the fiscal year. Chinese went home under circumstances such that they would never be allowed to come back to the number of 1,362. So you can imagine that the Chinese population is rapidly disappearing. Among those that are left the birth rate is very small, because the women are few in number; it only amounts to 5.7, so, that matter is settled.

I have in my hand a report issued by the British Columbia government, prepared by the research department of the economic council, they appear to have been very capable thorough scientific men and their conclusions have been justified by time. They say that

in the years 1938 to 1940 inclusive there will be an approximate decrease—note that—of 452 Chinese males thrown upon the labour market. Later on I shall tell you what the effect will be as regards Japanese labour coming on the market, it is a very different story. The Chinese who are left here are treated with respect, they are generally merchants carrying on trade between the two countries, and there is no ill will between us at all with the single exception which I have mentioned.

Coming now to the Japanese, a very different tale must be unfolded. We have a weird thing called a gentlemen's agreement with the Japanese. We have had it for many years. It was preceded in 1907, or possibly 1906, by riots in the streets of Vancouver; feeling then as now was running very high—I think it is more intense now—there were riots; I think the Japanese consulate was stoned and windows broken. The Hon. Mr. Lemieux, our late lamented Speaker, was sent to Japan to negotiate what was called a gentlemen's agreement. I should like to quote from the debate which took place on his return. Mr. Macpherson, then the member for Vancouver, speaking in the debate, as reported at page 2087 of Hansard of 1907-08, said:

They—

That is, the then government.

—have carried on negotiations with Japan which have resulted in stopping for all time any further influx of Japanese coolies into our country.

Mark that! And I suppose Mr. Macpherson believed what he said. But Mr. Sproule said, "How do you know?"

Mr. Macpherson: I will tell my hon. friend how I know. The Minister of Labour has just come back from Japan and he has stated in parliament upon his responsibility as a minister of the crown, that we need never fear any further immigration from Japan. That statement has been accepted by the house; that statement has been accepted by the country.

Mr. Sproule: No.

Mr. Macpherson: My hon. friend says, no.

Mr. Sproule: The hon. gentleman says that statement is accepted by the house and by the country. Had we not years ago a similar statement from the government that the Japanese would regulate immigration, and yet the Japanese government have not regulated immigration to the satisfaction of even the hon. member himself?

He then speaks of a period "four or five years ago," that is, four or five years precedent to 1907 or 1908. So that between thirty-five and forty years ago we were told this old love story, that we could trust the people of Japan and everything would be lovely. And now conditions are worse than they were then.

I think we are the only country in the world, at least we are the only dominion that

3

has an arrangement with Japan which allows labourers to come in. Some of them have gentlemen's agreements, but none to let labour come in. Here I should like to allude to—I do not want to use a harsh word so I will say the secrecy that has always been allowed to cover up and put a smoke screen around this gentlemen's agreement. That is one of the worst features of it. I find that in 1908, the Hon. Mr. Lemieux was speaking and he gave a short statement as to what this gentlemen's agreement was. It was the most vague and indefinite thing you can conceive. Let me quote the sense of it. I refer to page 1610 of Hansard of January 21, 1908. This is from a letter signed by a Japanese statesman—I do not know what his title was—addressed to Mr. Lemieux:

Acting in this spirit and having particular regard to circumstances of recent occurrence in British Columbia,—

That is the riots.

—the imperial government—

That is the Japanese government.

—have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada. In carrying out this purpose, the imperial government, in pursuance of the policy above stated, will give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada, with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the dominion as far as is compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.

That is the Japanese state. Well there is nothing very definite about that. Someone had the temerity to ask in the house just what was to be done: "Will the hon. minister tell the house to what extent the Japanese government promised to restrict emigration?" Mr. Lemieux replied:

My hon. friend is too inquisitive. I will not answer, not from disrespect for him, but because if I did answer I would commit an act unworthy of a Canadian representative and unworthy of myself.

Because he had agreed to various unknown, unstated things; he talks about stringent regulations and then refuses to give the information to the house. Then he says:

There is, however, one feature of these regulations which I am authorized to make public.

Then he refers to restriction of immigration; but it is all up in the air, in the clouds, and as we afterwards found out it stayed in the clouds. The result was that although the thing was supposed to be in existence, nobody knew anything about it. I once asked an immigration official this question: "If the Japanese gentlemen's agreement calls for only four hundred a year—for that is what it did at the time—"why did seventeen hundred come in last year?" The answer I got was, "I don't know. I have never seen the

VOLUME 2/21: H.D. WILSON, NEILL, A.W. "EXCLUSION OF
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION", HOUSE OF COMMONS,
OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES, 17 FEB. 1938.

4

gentlemen's agreement, and when a fellow comes along and says he is coming in under the gentlemen's agreement, we allow him to come in because we do not know anything to the contrary." There was an entire lack of what you might call fixity as to what the thing was or what it meant.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask at what time the incident took place to which my hon. friend just referred?

Mr. NEILL: The gentlemen's agreement was in 1908.

Mr. CRERAR: When did the seventeen hundred Japanese come in?

Mr. NEILL: It was along about 1917, as far as my memory serves me, but the figures were always exceeded. The gentlemen's agreement was not a gentlemen's agreement; it was a gentlemen's joke as far as one party to the bargain was concerned.

We are talking about gentlemen's agreements. I have in my hand a gentlemen's agreement about which there is no secrecy. This is a white paper, which corresponds to our Canadian blue-books, issued by the government of South Africa. Here is the gentlemen's agreement made with Japan, all above board; here they say who are to be allowed in, and who are not: 1. Tourists; 2. Persons visiting the Union solely for the purpose of study or scientific investigation; 3. Wholesale merchants and buyers of South African produce for export as well as their respective staffs; 4. The wives and children of any person admitted under paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. That is all. There was no labour immigration there; no permanency, because the agreement continues:

The permits issued under this understanding shall be for one year—

And they were renewable at the option of the government. To make it quite clear that South Africa was to remain a white Africa, this further clause was added:

Children born to any such person during such temporary domicile shall have no claim in consequence to Union nationality, birthright or domicile.

That is a very fine gentlemen's agreement; it is above board, for all to read and understand, and there is no labour immigration involved at all. It simply covers, as I have said, the diplomatic service, tourists, scientists, wholesale merchants and their wives and children.

However, we got a gentlemen's agreement, such as it was. It proved to be Dead sea

fruit as far as we were concerned, partly due to the secrecy involved and partly due to the necessarily loosely worded agreement made between two gentlemen who, it is expected, will vie with each other to see that they live up not to the letter but beyond the letter of the agreement. It does not work, however, when you make agreements like that and one of the parties is so mentally constituted, probably by tradition and heritage—I do not blame them altogether—that they do not deem it any dishonour to break even a written bargain, as we have seen in recent times, let alone one so vaguely expressed. That was the weak point.

After the war, feeling again ran very high, and in the spring of 1922 the hon. gentleman who now represents Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens), but who then represented Vancouver Centre, called together the British Columbia members. I think that was the first and only time the British Columbia members united about anything. There were four groups represented in that room on that occasion, and we agreed to introduce a resolution asking for the total exclusion of orientals. The government insisted on taking out those words and putting in "effective restriction," saying that meant the same thing. At page 1573 of Hansard for that session I asked:

Can the leader of the government give us an assurance that, in his mind, the words "effective restriction" in the amendment convey such a measure of restriction as is, at least, equal to the present immigration act in force in Australia to-day?

In Australia at that time they had no gentlemen's agreement, or if they had they also had a test by which the Japanese were totally excluded. It was a language test, which I need not go into now. The answer was:

Mr. Mackenzie King: I have in mind the same object exactly as the people of the country to which my hon. friend has referred had in mind when they enacted their legislation, namely to have a restriction that will be effective.

The then leader of the opposition, the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, suggested other words. He said, "Well, if you do not like the word 'exclusion', if that is offensive to the Japanese, why not use the word 'prohibition'?" When that was not accepted by the government he suggested other words, such as "for residence purposes," but that was not accepted. Then he suggested another phrase, "bringing to an end further such immigration for residence purposes." He made an honest attempt to produce something that would really mean effective restric-

5

tion, but the government did not accept any of his suggestions and put through their amendment using the words "effective restriction" instead of "total exclusion."

After that our committee of British Columbia members more or less disbanded and lost heart. Three of us carried on, two members from British Columbia who were on the Liberal side at that time, and myself. But we soon found that effective restriction did not mean the same as total exclusion, as carried out in Australia, by any means. However, we got something in 1923; we got the Chinese exclusion act put through, to which I have just referred. It worked well and, as I have said, it would have been all right if only we had included the Japanese as well. We used every influence we possessed and every influence we could influence to try to get the Japanese included as well.

Some of the members who came into the house when I did, in 1921, will remember—some of them have happily and conveniently forgotten—that during the strenuous times of 1922 and 1923 and more particularly 1925 and 1926, the minor groups in the house possessed a great deal more influence in regard to legislation than they do now. Even the voice of a lone independent was more vibrant before 1926 than it is now that big majorities have become the order of the day. Possibly that is a good thing for the big parties, but I do not know if it is a good thing for the small groups and the people they represent, who are generally what might be called underprivileged or those seeking some social or legislative justice but who are not sufficiently powerful to attract or command the notice and attention of the bigger parties. However, we kept on. We got the act respecting the Chinese, and it was a success. I well remember the bitter controversy at that time. The senate was lobbied; we were lobbied, and there was a tremendous uproar over the passing of that act, but there has not been a word of objection since. It was a success; in a word, it worked.

We were denied the same legislation with regard to Japanese. Time went on. My two conferees from British Columbia were defeated, largely because of the attitude of the government they had supported in making these promises and not delivering the goods. I persevered, but it was not until 1928, six years after the promise, that I secured even a measure of fulfilment of that promise with regard to the Japanese. The government of that day amended the gentlemen's agreement, and so far as that amendment went I give full credit and thanks to the then Prime Minister, who is also the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). He did two good

things. First he cut the number down from 400 to 150. Then, more important, he arranged that the great bulk of these immigrants would come in under the jurisdiction, so to speak, of our Immigration Act and our immigration authorities. That was a very good thing indeed. He also arranged that immigrants had to have their passports visaed in Japan by one of our agents there. It placed the agreement more or less under our control—but only more or less.

Since then the agreement has been in force and I am told—and it is easily ascertainable—that in several cases and, perhaps, in most of the years, less than the quota has come in. Perhaps that has been largely due to the depression and, in later years, due to internal conditions in Japan.

However, the usual loophole has been discovered, as it always has been, and always will be, by which more Japanese have come in under this gentlemen's agreement, as it is interpreted. I need not go into it now, but it does permit people to come in that I, at least, never contemplated would be allowed to come in except under the quota. If it came about that the Japanese were determined to force immigration, they would be able to do it, under the terms of this loophole. The really fatal mistake was in not making the Chinese act of 1923 apply to the Japanese also. The United States had done it, just about that time. They were threatened with tremendous consequences; sabres and swords were waved, but nothing happened. They were threatened with an enormous loss of trade—which would have lasted only two or three months. Trade will always go where trade finds it is best adapted to go, and it does not pay attention to matters of this kind.

If we had done it then we would only have been in line with the other dominions and, so far as I know, with other countries as well. The principle has often been laid down to protect the people native to a country against incursions, however legal, of aliens. By the native I do not mean the aborigines alone; they may be natives in the sense of having long occupancy in a country.

In Kenya colony in East Africa the British government, which has control, said they found it necessary to record their considered opinion that the interests of African natives must be paramount, and that if and when those interests and the interests of the immigrant nations conflicted, the former should prevail. That was the view taken by the British government.

Next we find General Smuts in a speech referring to the "warping influence of the fear of ultimate black domination." If we sub-

10P
stitute the word "Japanese" for "black" we have described the situation in British Columbia in our own country. He there mentioned the "warping influence of the fear of ultimate black domination."

Mr. K. K. Kawakami, one of Japan's most distinguished publicists, in an article written a few years ago said this:

People accustomed to low wages and therefore a low standard of living can successfully compete with and ultimately defeat people with a higher standard of living.

Sure. Here is the last illustration. I see connected with it the name of Sir Shenton Thomas, the gentleman who opened the Singapore base the other day. He was the governor, or whatever the position is, of the Malay colony. In this case, the Chinese and Indians, who were aliens, came in bringing in capital and dominating industry, and they were beginning to make demands for a place in the sun—jobs in the civil service, and permanent positions like that. He gave them what is described in the article as a cold rebuff when he announced that there would be no appointments to administrative positions among non-Malay Asiatics. They became angry, and said that much of the development was due to their effort, and so on.

Sir Shenton Thomas said that he did not deny that fact, but argued that the Malayan was in danger of being dispossessed in his own country, and that therefore special measures were necessary for his own protection. Some extensive land reservations which can never pass out of Malayan ownership, and certain non-manual government branches virtually reserved to Malaysians, are included in such measures.

That gives an illustration of what I have in mind. But we took the opposite view. Let me quote Mr. Lemieux in this connection. I do not suppose he thought he was making history, when he said, at page 1591 of Hansard for 1908:

The policy of this government has always been to let Japan herself regulate and restrict voluntarily the emigration of her subjects;—any other policy would not have been successful with that nation.

That is, the emigration to Canada—
That is the trouble. We have surrendered our right of control of the immigration into our country of the subjects of a foreign nation. There was the initial mistake, and it has endured ever since. That will conclude my observations on this phase of the matter. I would ask that you call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, the modified gentlemen's agreement of which I spoke before six o'clock, and which came into effect, I think, in September, 1928, had five major bad consequences or effects.

First, it missed a good opportunity of settling once for all a question that was bound to rise up again and again, and be more and more troublesome each time it came up.

Second, being a gentleman's agreement, of very necessity its terms were so slack that it offered large opportunities for evasion. I said, in speaking this afternoon, that the quota had been generally lived up to. Yes, according to the figures you will get over at the immigration department, if you send for them, that is correct.

But this is an instance that came to my notice. It is in a confidential statement, and I cannot give its source, but every name is given, and I can guarantee its bona fides. The mounted police had in hand certain fraudulent transactions in connection with birth certificates, and they found that seventy-five Japanese birth certificates had been faked and 117 fishing licences illegally obtained. The Japanese interpreter—and the interpreter is always Japanese, never a white man—went to the penitentiary for two and a half years over that, but I do not suppose there is a member of the house who has ever heard a word of that transaction but myself. Now, if after investigation they managed to find seventy-five such instances, surely we can suppose that at least three times that number actually evaded the regulations. Other members, no doubt, can give similar instances.

In any case, even supposing there is no evasion, the Japanese agreement allows an increase of the adult Japanese population every year in a situation which is already overloaded. I quote again the British Economic Council's report, which was a very valuable document, and time has proved how accurately and carefully it was drawn up. They say that in the years from 1936 to 1940 the increase of Japanese will throw on the labour market 3,574 people, or an average of 774 a year. That was not an increase to the population by way of infants, but the number that would be thrown on to the labour market in those years, and it gives an average—and they itemize it, by both birth and immigration—of 774. That could well be done away with, considering the situation in British Columbia.

The third objection is that in times of depression, when it is necessary to forbid our own white citizens from the British

Empire entering this country, and the Bennett government in, I think, 1931 or possibly 1930, passed an order in council seriously restricting the immigration of ordinary labourers from the British Isles, and necessarily so, for the protection of the Canadian working man—

Mr. BENNETT: It is still in force.

Mr. NEILL: But at that same time, under the gentleman's agreement, the Japanese could send in their quota, and as much more as they could get away with, in defiance of any immigration order the government had passed. That is the serious objection. It is a wholly untenable and undesirable position for us to be in.

Fourth—and this is one of the major objections—it hands over the control of immigration to the judgment of an alien nation—a thing that is not done anywhere else in the world.

Let me quote from page 2039 of volume 2 of Hansard of 1908, and this is no mere back-bencher like myself speaking, but a man whose words are entitled to some respect, the late Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden. He said:

Now I come more particularly to the results of the mission to Japan of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. The real object of his mission was to induce Japan to exercise that control over immigration into Canada which we should be able to exercise ourselves. It is one of the attributes of the sovereign power of any state to restrict, or even altogether prohibit, the entrance of aliens within its territory. If we had preserved that right by the stipulation insisted upon by the Conservative government in August, 1895, there would have been no difficulty. We did not reserve that right; therefore, having passed over to the Japanese government that control which should have been exercised by ourselves, it became necessary for my hon. friend the Postmaster General to go to the Japanese government and to ask them to exercise some control and some regulation.

At another point the same gentleman moved an amendment to this effect to the motion which was before the house, at page 2146 of the same volume of Hansard:

That this house while expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurances of the Japanese government, and while declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires nevertheless to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage-earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition except by entreating the forbearance and aid of a foreign government.

The words "wage-earning" might now be taken out and there be inserted instead "the population of British Columbia", because it

is no longer the wage-earners' problem, but applies to every industry, high and low, in the province.

Worst of all, the agreement even as amended puts us in the most invidious position as regards China. China has been a divided nation, and therefore has received perhaps less attention than she should have, but she will come back a unified nation with her four hundred millions of population, with her trained soldiers—I think it was General Gordon who said that the Chinese soldiers were the best in the world—and with her market potentialities of four hundred million purchasers. We will go to China and she will say: You want to trade with us, but why do you treat us so differently from the way you treat the Japanese? And what answer can we give? We shall then be in this position: Either we shall have to reinstate Chinese immigration, which is very undesirable, or under the pressure of China's population of four hundred millions and her soldiers we shall have to put the Japanese back where I now seek to put them. If we are going to do it under pressure from China then, why not let us do it now with all the goodwill that comes from a free will act of justice? Let us do it now rather than under pressure later.

I remember that Mr. Meighen, when the debate was on in 1922, said this:

Let us proceed to argument. I stated first that there had been effective exclusion of the inhabitants of China in the United States. My hon. friend—

That was the then Prime Minister:

My hon. friend says: "Oh, yes, but China is not a first class power."

Then Mr. Meighen continued:
Are we to modify our language according to the number of troops that there may be in the nation to which that language refers? I do not think Japan would expect us to do that; I do not think China would be flattered to know that that is the reason she is excluded.

That is all I have to say about the gentleman's agreement. I have been told that my bill does not go far enough; that it does not touch the biggest feature of all, and I admit it. The biggest feature of all is the enormous birthrate of the Japanese in British Columbia about 38 per thousand as against 18. I have in my hand figures, and I shall give them briefly.

The school enrolment in British Columbia in the ten years 1927 to 1937 went up twelve per cent; the Japanese enrolment went up eighty-eight per cent. These are significant

VOLUME 2/21: H.D. WILSON, NEILL, A.W. "EXCLUSION OF
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION", HOUSE OF COMMONS,
OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES, 17 FEB. 1938.

8

figures; multiply them by the next ten or twenty years and what kind of situation does it present to your mind? The answer is, of course, that we cannot stop their birth rate—unless we are prepared to bring them under the provisions of chapter 258 of the revised statutes of British Columbia—but we can at least stop adult immigration coming in to add to the vicious circle—more immigrants, more children, more men and women thrown on the labour market, and not only the labour market but all industries in British Columbia. Since even 1923 the legal immigration would mean perhaps twenty-three or twenty-five hundred people, all young people with the potentialities of large families. It may be said: Let us deport them. That is impossible. But we can at least stop the legal entry of them, and above all stop the loopholes that seem inevitably to be connected with any gentleman's agreement, however carefully drawn.

I ask support of this bill on its merits, to correct past errors and prevent more. I ask support from hon. members from all over Canada. It may be said that the east has no such problem. I tell hon. members from Quebec province and also those representing the industrial centres of Ontario: It does concern you. It concerns you vitally. Your line of defence against fatally cheap labour competition is not Montreal or Toronto; it is in

British Columbia; it may be our trouble to-day, but it is your's to-morrow. If you in Quebec had the oriental population that we have the numbers would be 265,000; in Ontario they would be 312,000. Just where would you be then? Remember they are all of alien thought and mind and tendency; they are all one body, acting and thinking as a unit. Just where would you put 312,000 in Ontario, and how would you like to have them?

I ask support to this bill with no idea, no hint of taking advantage of the popular prejudice on account of what has gone on during the last year or two. I have never mentioned the war. I ask support on a non-partisan basis. This is not a bill brought down by the government, immediately ipso facto to be opposed by the opposition. It is not brought in by the opposition, immediately to be regarded as suspect by the government, as a device to embarrass them. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) recently said, with reference to a matter brought in by a private member, "It is a good thing to have a frank and sincere consideration of the subject." It may be well said, if we pass this bill, that it is not the act of any party in the house, it is the act of parliament, which is paramount. Therefore, in all sincerity, I ask the support of every member of this house to this bill.

After eight other members from British Columbia, and Mr. Bennett, had spoken in favour of the Bill, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke at some length opposing it, and moved the adjournment of the debate, which, under the rules, will probably prohibit the bill from coming up again this session.

A. W. N.