

them an understanding that did not commend itself to my mind in all its fulness. My hon. friend praised the Japanese very much. I have no objection to them. They are without doubt a very clever people. They have a great many traits that are desirable in the citizens of any nation. But, if I understood my hon. friend from Rouville aright, he thought it would not be a bad thing to let the Japs come in. When the hon. gentleman was in Japan he probably did not mix with the people who come here as immigrants; he mixed no doubt with the bon-ton. If a very prominent minister of Japan came here he would mix with the bon-ton. He would meet the Government and you, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, and move among the very best in the land; but is it fair to assume that the experience which my hon. friend from Rouville obtained in his pleasant journey through Japan would be sufficient to enable him to give a very expert opinion on the desirability of the people who constitute the migrating classes? Let us also observe, as to what my hon. friend from Rouville said with regard to the Hindus, that, while it has considerable truth, I think it is not an argument that will bear the closest scrutiny. He speaks of these people as being British subjects.

My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), whom I do not see in his place, was not quite fair to the hon. member for Rouville, when, in commenting on that hon. gentleman's speech, he rang the changes on the idea that the hon. gentleman had 'championed' the Hindus. Of course no one cares very much that the hon. member for Vancouver feels it necessary to frame up a 'Hansard' speech for his people, but he knows very well that the hon. member for Rouville never 'championed' the Hindus and never 'associated himself' with them, to use the words used by the hon. member for Vancouver. The hon. member for Rouville did say that the Hindus were British subjects. Now, if there is any member of this House so much afraid of his own ground that he will not even venture to state a simple fact like that, he only shows the weakness of his position. If my position were so weak that I feared to say that a Hindu was a British subject, the knowledge of that fact would dictate to me the advisability of trying to find some stronger ground. The hon. member for Rouville said that these people were subject to the same King as ourselves; and he urged the critics on the

other side not to get away from that fact, especially as they claimed the monopoly of the jingo talk about the races of the empire having the same King and bowing before the same throne. But I would say to the hon. member for Rouville, that, even though these people are British subjects, that does not settle the whole matter. There is many a British subject taken out and hanged until he is dead; many a British subject gets the lash for villainous conduct of which he has been proven guilty. For my part, I think that, British subjects though they may be, the less of the Hindus we have in Canada the better. And while I have no authority to speak for any person on this side of the House except for myself, yet if you look over the record of the Laurier Government you will see that that record justifies me in saying that every man on this side believes as I do, that the less of the Hindus we have the better. The Laurier Government shut the Hindus out; a very few of these people came in during the last year when the Laurier Government was in power only one-fifth as many came in in 1913, under this Government. So, the hon. member for Vancouver need not put on sackcloth and bemoan the bad conduct of the Laurier Government. They may have lacked in cheap talk, in clap-trap and twaddle, but they 'delivered the goods' to the extent of letting in only one-fifth the number of Hindus that were let in by the Government which the hon. member for Vancouver supports.

The hon. member for Vancouver also speaks of the different kinds of immigration. He should remember that this Government has been bringing in as many Chinese and more Japanese and Hindus than their predecessors, and that under this Government Orientals are being employed in the mines, that very important industry in British Columbia, to a greater extent than they were when the Laurier Administration was in existence. The Minister of the Interior, according to information that appears in 'Hansard,' says that in 1911 the number of Chinese coming into Canada was 6,817; in 1912, there were 7,146; and in the eleven months of 1903, there were 5,988—a little increase since the present Government came into power. With regard to the Japanese in the last year of the Laurier Government there were 727 Japanese entered Canada, and last year 836. Of Hindus there were 14 in 1911, and 88 in 1913. When hon.