

the knowledge of members the correspondence which preceded the adoption for Canada of the Anglo-Japanese convention of 1906. My principal desire in proposing this motion to the House is to find out what representations were made to this government, either by the Imperial government, by the government of Japan, or by other parties, as the motion indicates, concerning particularly Article 1 of the treaty of commerce between Great Britain and Japan which was signed on July 16, 1894, and to which Canada adhered under the agreement which was made at Tokio on January 31, 1906. I will read that article as it is important:

The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties should have full liberty to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the Dominions and possessions of the other contracting party, and should enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

They should have free and easy access to the courts of justice in pursuit and defence of their rights; they should be at liberty equally with native subjects to choose and employ lawyers, advocates and representatives to pursue and defend their rights before such courts, and in all other matters connected with the administration of justice they should enjoy all the rights and privileges enjoyed by native subjects.

In whatever relates to rights of residence and travel; to the possession of goods and effects of any kind; to the succession to personal estate, by will or otherwise, and the disposal of property of any sort in any manner whatsoever which they may lawfully acquire, the subjects of each contracting party should enjoy in the dominions and possessions of the other the same privileges, liberties and rights, and should be subject to no higher imposts or charges in these respects than native subjects, or subjects or citizens of the most favoured nation. The subjects of each of the contracting parties should enjoy in the dominions and possessions of the other entire liberty of conscience, and, subject to the laws, ordinances and regulations, should enjoy the right of private or public exercise of their worship, and also the right of burying their respective countrymen according to their religious customs, in such suitable and convenient places as may be established and maintained for that purpose.

They should not be compelled, under any pretext whatsoever, to pay any charges or taxes other or higher than those that are, or may be, paid by native subjects, or subjects or citizens of the most favoured nation.

This clause, I say, is important. It has given rise in this country to a great deal of comment on the part of many people who take a deep interest in immigration, and who severely condemn our adhering to such an agreement. But there are other clauses in the treaty that have a commercial aspect, and in regard to which we would like to have the correspondence, which, I believe, has never been laid upon the table of the House. There must have been

Mr. MONK.

quite an extensive correspondence between the home government and the government of the Dominion. I think I am not mistaken when I say that all the important dependencies of Great Britain were excluded from the operation of the treaty. I quote from article 19 of the treaty of commerce between Great Britain and Japan, in 1894:

The stipulations of the present treaty shall be applicable, so far as the laws permit, to all the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, excepting to those hereinafter named, that is to say, except to India, the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Cape, Natal, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia and New Zealand. Provided always that the stipulations of the present treaty shall be made applicable to any of the above-named colonies or foreign possessions on whose behalf notice to that effect shall have been given to the Japanese government by Her Britannic Majesty's representative at Tokio within two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty.

I am not aware that any of those dependencies except Canada has agreed to the treaty, but I have no positive information on that subject. They were given two years in which to adhere to it, and it was only in 1906 that we, through the British ambassador in Japan, adhered to the treaty and to all the clauses contained in it. Now, Sir, that stipulation of a free entry into this country of Japanese subjects is a very grave matter indeed, and I think we should see all the correspondence on that subject as soon as possible. I said there had been correspondence between the home government and the government here. There may have been some correspondence also between this government and the Japanese consul here, possibly some correspondence also with Japan, although I presume that direct communication could only be made through the colonial office and the embassy in Japan. But the motion aims further to get all the correspondence between the government of Canada and any person or persons, and the reports communicated to the government in respect of that Anglo-Japanese convention regarding Canada. I think it was about the time this convention was entered into that our Mr. Preston, who had been a long time controller of European immigration, ceased to occupy that post in Europe, and he was sent elsewhere. I believe at that time he was sent to Japan, if I mistake not, at any rate I saw that he had visited that country, and I presume that in the exercise of the new functions which the government gave him he had occasion to send in reports and communications to this government which had come directly from that country. It would be interesting to see these reports, and to see the recommendations contained therein.

I do not wish at this moment to go into the