

gentlemen opposite were in opposition, a constant wail went up from them about the influx of Orientals, and assurances to the public that if they were put in power this immigration would cease. As a matter of fact, we see that there has been a substantial increase in the number of Japanese and a multiplication of more than five of the number of Hindus coming into Canada. So, I think the hon. member for Vancouver had better reserve his criticisms of this side of the House and confine those criticisms to the party of which he is a member of and the Government which he supports.

I have here the report of a question by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the answer to that question by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). The question was: 'How many colliery workers did the minister find to be engaged in Vancouver Island, B.C., during his recent investigation?' And the answer was: 690. 'How many of these were Orientals?' Answer: 432; more than two out of three were Orientals. My hon. friend need not attempt to deny these facts. The late Government did not leave any troublesome problem for their successors to deal with. The matter had been dealt with and solved before the Laurier Administration went out of power.

My hon. friend from Edmonton and my hon. friend from Rouville during the course of their remarks kept away from anything of a partisan nature. No one can contradict that. But the hon. member for Vancouver, who was a member of the House when we were endeavouring to solve the immigration question in the West, rose and almost the first thing he said was to the effect that the late Government had made trouble for their successors—that every iota of trouble the present Government had had in this matter arose from the fault and folly and wrongdoing of the former Government. I had hoped that when I spoke I should be able to follow the course taken by my hon. friends who preceded me. But the member for Vancouver got away from that non-partisan attitude and commenced to lay on the lash to the former Government in the most unkind, heartless way, as he so well knows how to do. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has to leave the Chamber again, but hope he will be back later. He will see 'Hansard,' and I hope he will follow what I say. The hon. gentleman's words were so full of wisdom. Some difference of opinion had arisen between the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and

[Mr. Knowles.]

the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) as to whether the law laid down by Chief Justice Archambault in the Thaw case could possibly be of assistance in the habeas corpus proceedings in British Columbia. I should have thought it a great help to follow any habeas corpus proceedings especially when, as in this case, the point involved was one of immigration. But the hon. member for Vancouver brushes both the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Rouville aside. He does not care what law Mr. Chief Justice Archambault may have discovered or what principles of law he may have enunciated. The very valuable time of the hon. member for Vancouver was grossly wasted, it would appear, by the quotation of remarks of Judge Archambault.

The hon. gentlemen (Mr. Stevens) also went through a long rigamarole about the ethnical characteristics of the Hindu. I do not know that we here are very much concerned with that. It is a problem that most concerns his own Government. If the Hindu is to be kept out, why does not the hon. gentleman hammer his Government for not keeping them out? Hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side talked about Oriental immigration, and were not slow to say that it ought to be kept out. In the election of 1908 this was one of the very liveliest questions in British Columbia; indeed, the liveliest question possible.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side through their supporters in the Conservative party in British Columbia, went so far that even the prison doors did not frighten them, and they committed forgery for the sake of electing one of their members in the city of Victoria, on a forged telegram; and the member for Victoria, honourable gentleman as he is, I am sorry to say held his seat in this House for a whole term of Parliament, by reason of the effect of that forged telegram and the nefarious work in connection with it. Why does not the hon. gentleman speak his mind to his Government? Why does he make these high flamboyant speeches, so that he may send out 'Hansard' to-morrow containing them—and now he is running back and forward to 'Hansard' room so that his speech will be in apple-pie shape at ten o'clock in the morning, when he can mail it to Vancouver. Why is he so careful to make an academic speech and get off his sophistries? Why does he not go at it hammer and tongs, and say to the Prime Minister: I will not support you unless you