

certain arrangement with the previous Government to restrict immigration to a certain number. The Japanese Government have lived up to that agreement, so far as our information goes. We have been twitted by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) for not having entirely barred the Japanese from this country. It is true that when that question was first brought before this Parliament, it met with certain opposition from the Conservative Opposition of that time on the ground that we were surrendering the control of our immigration, and that we should not leave it entirely in the hand of a foreign Government to say how many should come to this country. But it is one thing to enter into an international agreement and quite another thing to break that agreement when once put into force. And last year when the treaty was being assented to, in view of the fact that the Japanese Government had lived up to their contract, so far as our figures went to prove, we did not feel justified in cancelling that agreement and entering into any process of exclusion. But what we did, and the hon. member for Moosejaw failed to enlighten the House upon this point, was to reserve control over the immigration by means of our immigration laws.

This is a distinct reservation which we made in connection with the treaty, and which we can call into requisition when we think it advisable. We have not surrendered our control over immigration even under the signing of the agreement. Last year 886 Japanese immigrants entered Canada. That is to say, that was the number of Japanese passengers coming into Canada. But quite a number of Japanese returned to their own country. The figures supplied us by the Consul-General of Japan at Vancouver, show, that as a matter of fact, the net increase of the Japanese population as the result of last year's immigration was 167. And of the 886 Japanese who came to Canada last year, how many were of the labouring class? Not a dozen. So, I do not think that the accusation that by passing this Order in Council, 2642, by which we prohibit immigration up to March 31, 1914, of all labourers coming into British Columbia, we discriminated against the white labourers in favour of the Japanese or Chinese, as stated by the hon. member for Edmonton, can justly be made. As to the immigration of Chinese, that, as I have pointed out, is regulated by the Chinese Act. We cannot override that by

[Mr. Roche.]

Order in Council. And, so far as the Japanese are concerned, the figures, as I have said, go to show that during the whole year there were not more than a dozen of the labouring class who came in.

Now, so far as the Hindus are concerned, that is a vexed question, and one that is far more difficult to deal with by reason of empire relations. The Hindus in British Columbia, a number of them, have been keeping up a strenuous agitation to have the courts declare our Orders in Council invalid because ultra vires. They have gone so far—and this is patent, it is a matter of public notoriety—as to try to bring pressure to bear on the Home Government to have these regulations relaxed in their own interest. The hon. member for Moosejaw says that 88 Hindus came in last year—five times the number under the Conservative Government that came in under the Liberal Government. Fourteen came in in 1911, that is true. It is true also that 88 came in last year. But why? Was it by reason of the actions of this Government in relaxing the law under which the Liberal Government allowed them to come into this country? No, it was the very same law, the very same regulation, under which the eighty-eight came in and the fourteen came in. So, if fault is to be found, it is not with this Government. I do not wish to give a partisan tinge to this debate. In that connection I was rather amused with the hon. member for Moosejaw. He rose with his whole speech prepared, with 'Hansard' marked to show that Conservative speakers had made certain statements and so on—he had prepared himself to make a partisan political speech. Yet, he accused the hon. member for Vancouver of having introduced partisanship into the debate. He should rather have thanked the hon. member for giving him the excuse to work off the speech which he prepared to make. The hon. gentleman has one advantage over most of us—he had his training in the pulpit. That is apparent to us all. The lack of partisanship, on his part, the dignified manner in which he discusses questions in this House, of course, greatly impresses all hon. members. The speech which he delivered to-day was in keeping with the others we have heard from him in this House. The hon. gentleman demanded why the Conservatives had allowed five times as many to come in last year as in 1911. They came in under the regulation which was declared by Mr. Chief Justice Hunter of British Columbia to be ultra vires in that it did not follow the words of