

in the duty of legislation on that question. If that is the only way in which the papers will be of any service, why should the country be put to this expense, because it will afford a great deal of trouble to the clerks and cause a great deal of expense to get all the information that this Address calls for? We had some years ago a very expensive commission sent to British Columbia on this very question, and my humble opinion is if that commission has not afforded us all the information we require on this question for the next 10 years, then we have paid a great deal too much money for the service. For my part I do not think this Address should be granted; for taking the words of the hon gentleman himself it cannot serve the purpose which the hon. gentleman has referred to.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am very much interested in getting this information myself. I take a deep interest in the immigration of the Chinese, as I believe that they are a very essential element in building up the Province of British Columbia. Since I saw them out there I have come to the conclusion that they are of great value to the country. If I thought that this Address would incur great expense or delay I would oppose it; but the information must be in the hands of the Department and it cannot take very much time or trouble to have it copied and in the hands of the House.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—When the hon. gentleman from Richmond says that the report of the Chinese commission which cost something like \$10,000 or \$12,000 ought to contain all the information we require on this subject for the next 10 years, I quite agree with him on that point, but the hon. gentleman will see at a glance that that voluminous report of the Chinese commission does not appear to contain all the necessary information respecting Chinese immigration to crystallise into a workable Act. As an evidence of this I have only to refer the hon. gentleman to the fact that although the Chinese restriction Act was framed and passed through the instrumentality of the Chairman of that

celebrated Chinese commission—Mr. Chapleau—yet there has not been a year since it was placed upon our Statutes but what he has been bringing in amendments of one kind and another. As the Act has been in force only two years, and as I ask only for information covering the first eighteen months of the operation of the Act, I must confess I am unable to understand why there should be any delay or extra expense in bringing down the return I ask for. If the Departments are kept “in apple pie” shape as they should be from the great number of clerks in them—the proper officials ought to be able to lay their hands on all I ask for in 20 minutes—except perhaps that portion referring to documentary evidence of fraud. I am perfectly willing that that portion should drop out, but so far as the rest of the Return is concerned if the Department is run as it ought to be they ought to be in a position to furnish the Return in 15 minutes without \$1 of extra cost.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I rise to support the motion of the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, for I entirely agree with him that this House cannot approach that question and intelligently form an opinion on it without having those facts made known to them. I entirely concur in his view as to the probability of the information being brought down in time, before the Chinese Bill reaches this House. If I supposed it was a document requiring a great many clerks and a great deal of time to prepare, there might be some objection to sustaining the motion. I do not think it can be done in fifteen minutes, but I am quite sure that before the House meets, after the short recess that is proposed, that information can be submitted to us. When it is remembered that this House last session objected to a Government Bill amending that Act, the Government themselves must see the importance of furnishing the Senate with the information if they have any object at all in carrying their measure this session. A great deal of opposition was evinced in this Chamber to the Bill of last session, and certainly in the absence of the information which is here asked for, those who opposed