

in any treaty, and they were compelled to leave to the Liberal administration which succeeded them the obligation of carrying that into effect. But the Liberal administration did not do it. I am not here tonight to make any attack on the people of Japan.

No British subject can fail to admire the greatness, the intelligence, the industry and ability of that great people. But we have a right, on the floor of this House and before the people of this country, to arraign this government for any mal-administration, mistake or neglect of the interest of the Canadian people, and I submit that it is our duty, as members of parliament, to bring to the attention of the people those points on which the government has failed to maintain Canadian interests in this matter. This is a most important question as affecting the future interests of Canada. If we wish to have a national policy, if we claim the right to protect the manufacturing and commercial interests of our country, we should have the same right to protect our labouring men from the competition of any immigration that will be detrimental to their welfare. In that regard I attack this present administration in respect of the matters under discussion. The making of treaties is a thing of great and serious importance. There seems to be what might be called quite an epidemic of treaty making among hon. gentlemen opposite. As Canadians we desire to make our own treaties, but if the government wish to make treaties with credit and advantage to the people of this country they should carry on their work with due attention to the interests of the Canadian people that a business man would give to his own affairs. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) asks us: Why do you not move to denounce the treaty? I submit that it is open to us to denounce these inefficient and amateur treaty-makers, but there is no responsibility upon those on this side to denounce the treaty. That is a question that comes within the scope of the government's duty. Why? Because, as a government, they alone are in possession of all the facts; they alone have control of the machinery by which the matter is to be investigated. Therefore, they must take the responsibility of deciding whether the treaty should be denounced or not. That responsibility does not rest upon the opposition; we have not the information upon which to act. Our responsibility begins and ends when, in a fair and reasonable spirit, we present to the House and the people the facts of this very important matter. And so, in conclusion, I would say that when the government helped themselves so liberally as they did in 1896 to the various policies of the Conservative party, I think it would have been very much in the interest of the people of Canada if they had also helped themselves

to the Conservative policy for the prevention of this undesirable immigration.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) has extended his sympathy to the members of British Columbia for what he is pleased to call their anxiety to square themselves. We appreciate the kindness of heart that prompted that sympathy; we appreciate also the sympathy itself. But I hasten to assure the hon. gentleman that we do not deserve it and we do not need it. We have no 'squaring' to do. The position which the members from British Columbia take at this time is exactly the position they took when this treaty was unanimously ratified by parliament about a year ago. If there is any 'squaring' to be done, it must be done by such gentlemen as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and others who take the directly opposite position to that taken by the minister in January last when the treaty was ratified. So far as the leader of the opposition is concerned, he fully agreed to the ratification of this treaty with the correspondence in his possession—correspondence asked for by himself, laid on the table at his request, and available to him for six months before the treaty was ratified. That correspondence contained no assurance; it said nothing about the explanations which are now made by this government in reference to these assurances. The hon. gentleman agreed to the ratification of the treaty without any assurance regarding the restriction of Japanese immigration, and without the knowledge of the explanations since made by the government. If he could accept the treaty without these assurances, how can he quarrel with the ratification of the treaty and with his own action in that connection, now that he has possession of these assurances? So, as I say, if there is any 'squaring' to be done it must be done by hon. gentlemen opposite who unanimously voted for the ratification of this treaty.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto speaks of a Japanese immigration into this country because of the ratification of this treaty. Surely he will not argue that if the treaty had not been ratified this immigration would not have taken place? Surely the Japanese were at least as free to come into this country before the treaty was ratified as they were afterwards. How, then, can the hon. gentleman say that because of the ratification of this treaty the immigration took place? I dealt with the merits of this question at some length in this House, and I do not wish to repeat the arguments I then made. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to some matters connected with the correspondence brought down and the explanations made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux).