

I want to emphasize the difference between administrative and legislative responsibility and to place myself before the House as having acted so far absolutely according to administrative responsibility. As to legislative responsibility, that is a matter in which my hon. friend will have to assume his share of responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government any policy on this question?

Mr. OLIVER. The question has only just arisen. Would my hon. friend suggest that we should adopt a drastic policy because of an occasional incident of immigration? We do not know that there is such a campaign being organized as my hon. friend (Mr. Thoburn) alleges. No doubt there has been some talk in the newspapers about such a campaign, but that has only arisen within the last month, and, therefore, we are hardly chargeable with negligence in not having framed a policy to anticipate something which so far is only in the prospective stage.

Mr. THOBURN. Does the hon. minister think that it is in the best interests of Canada that we should have this negro colonization in our Northwest? I should like to draw attention to this clause in the article to which I have referred:

The opinion is freely offered that steps should be taken by the Dominion government to put a stop to a class of immigration that the experience of the southern states would indicate is hardly to be considered to be desirable.

Would the hon. minister think it advisable that we should change our law so as to enable the government to interdict immigration of this character?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). If the proposition of my hon. friend involves anything, it means that the minister should provide some further legislation which would enable him to exclude from Canada, on account of colour, people who at present do not come within any of the provisions regarding undesirables. Of course, if a man be undesirable within the meaning of the statute, he should be excluded, whether he be coloured or white; but I trust that my hon. friends opposite do not propose to exclude a man simply because of his colour, whether from the United States or any other part of the world. The law we have is very broad. It has ample provisions dealing with the exclusion of undesirables, no matter from what country they come, or of what colour, or nationality. But does my hon. friend pretend that we should exclude a man simply because he is coloured, regardless whether he be an undesirable or not in other respects.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. THOBURN. Will the minister answer my question?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken several times and cannot take up further the time of the House unless with the consent of the House.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I desire to draw attention to the non-fulfilment by the United States of their obligation under the Fisheries Treaty of 1908. That treaty was not of Canadian seeking but like other arrangements, not necessary to revert to at present, was entered into at the solicitation of the United States. At the time it was supposed to be a matter of urgency, and time was made the essence of the contract from the beginning. It was provided that the commissioners should be appointed for three months and that, within six months after appointment, they should draw up a set of regulations to govern the international fisheries. It was further provided that the two governments should enforce by legislation and executive action, with as little delay as possible, whatever regulations those commissioners might agree to. It was also agreed by the Canadian government that they should make certain concurrent regulations with respect to the fisheries on the Fraser river. On the part of Canada, as usual, there was rigid compliance with the stipulations of this treaty. We appointed our commissioner and adopted regulations and made the concurrent regulations respecting the Fraser river. On the part of the United States, however, the whole result of this attempt at fisheries regulation was to secure a draft made by the two commissioners binding upon Canada, to which the Marine and Fisheries Department has adhered, so far as Canadian fisheries are concerned, but to which, in the two years that have elapsed, the United States have not paid the slightest attention. I find that these regulations were transmitted to Congress by President Taft, in his message of February, 1910. In that message, President Taft submitted the report of Secretary of State Knox, in which Mr. Knox said:

It is appropriate that they should now be transmitted by you to the Congress in order that due legislative action on the part of this government, stipulated for by article III, of the treaty, may be taken.

By the Congress of 1910 no action was taken. Again, in 1911, the regulations were recommended to the consideration of Congress, but Congress rose without any action being taken at that second session. We have no record of any appeal on the part of this government against the breach of faith implied by the failure of the execu-