

larly, I believe, is seeking, outside of the present limits of the empire, new spheres of settlement and establishment because her inhabitants are so numerous. There is a fundamental objection to people whose customs, whose habits and whose civilization are entirely and absolutely different, and, under those circumstances, ought we, who are at the present moment nation building, in a country where there are already different races, though all European, endeavouring to assimilate, to allow to come in absolutely unrestricted a people so much at variance, so different from ourselves? I maintain that we should not, and I therefore consider that the government acted very incautiously, very inconsiderately, very imprudently in adhering to that clause of the treaty concluded between Great Britain and Japan. It is a clause usually adopted in treaties between European nations and under the circumstances of this treaty there was no reason for not inserting that usual, formal clause, because nobody anticipated and nobody could anticipate while treating for Great Britain that there would be any considerable invasion or immigration into Great Britain of Japanese. The thing never had occurred and never could occur, and there was no reason why that clause which is found in numberless treaties should not be inserted in this particular one. But, when we came to adhere to the treaty we should have made at that time a restriction in regard to immigration—a restriction in favour of Japan and in favour of ourselves. There would have been nothing whatever offensive in the insertion of that restriction, it was a reserve of the most ordinary prudence and caution, and how the government came to omit it I cannot understand. At any rate we will have, if this motion is adopted by the House, all the papers and correspondence, perhaps the justification of the assurance which was at that time given by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and we will be in a better position to appreciate this very grave situation.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have no fault to find whatever with the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), with the spirit which characterized them or with the manner in which they were expressed. The House is entitled to the fullest information upon this subject. My hon. friend has very properly drawn attention to the fact that our civilization and the civilization of the oriental nations is so much at variance that it will be difficult for many years to come, if not for generations, perhaps for ever, to remove these objections which exist at the present day. I am quite sure they exist in a remarkable degree—in a degree that we cannot forget and certainly the considerations which my hon. friend presented to the House a few moments ago were in our minds when we determined to adhere to the

Mr. MONK.

treaty which had been negotiated between Japan and Great Britain some fourteen years ago. The House is entitled to have the fullest information upon the subject, it must have it and therefore the government have no objection to the motion and agree that it should be carried. I may say to my hon. friend, however, that for reasons which he will appreciate, it would not be advisable that these papers should be brought down and made public while Mr. Lemieux is still in Japan in connection with this very subject. We hope that Mr. Lemieux will be back in a very short time, but at all events if,—I will leave it to my hon. friend himself—in the opinion of the House the delay should be unduly great, the papers can be called for.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? He has spoken of Mr. Lemieux. On what ground does Mr. Lemieux stand as our representative in Tokio?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is difficult to exactly define on what ground Mr. Lemieux stands. We have, as my hon. friend knows, no diplomatic status anywhere, but Mr. Lemieux has been introduced to the authorities at Tokio by His Majesty's ambassador, and it is under His Majesty's ambassador that negotiations—if negotiations they can be called—are being conducted, or that the representations are being made by Mr. Lemieux.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION—TENDERS.

Mr. JACOB T. SCHELL (Glengarry) moved for:

A return showing: 1. The estimated quantities used by the Transcontinental Railway Commission for arriving at the moneyed values of the tenders for the construction of the 50 miles, more or less, from Moncton westerly; for the construction of 62 miles, more or less, from Grand Falls westerly; from the south side of the St. Lawrence river, easterly 150 miles; for the 45 miles, more or less, westerly from near La Tuque; and for the 150 miles easterly from near Abitibi, known as the Abitibi section.

2. The various prices which each tenderer placed opposite the several items in the schedule or form of tender.

3. The total amount so ascertained of each tender.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a year ago a somewhat similar motion was placed before the House with reference to a contract which had been let upon the Transcontinental Railway previous to the contract referred to in this motion. I ask for the returns specified in this motion for two reasons. In the first place I wish the information asked for to be brought down; in the second place I wish to refer to the manner in